DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 980 UD 010 458

AUTHOR	Hernandez, Luis F.
TITLE	A Forgotten American: A Resource Unit for Teachers on the Mexican American.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	56p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Ave., New York, N.Y. 10016 ($0.75)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.90
DESCRIPTORS	Acculturation, Classroom Techniques, *Cultural Background, Cultural Differences, Culture Conflict, Curriculum Enrichment, Mexican American History, *Mexican Americans, Program Development, *Racial Characteristics, Reinforcement, *Resource Materials, Self Concept, Spanish Speaking, *Teaching Guides
IDENTIFIERS	Chicano Power

ABSTRACT

This guide for teachers on the Mexican American provides information as to their origin and background, history, and culture, their acculturation through time, the conflicting values they possess in relation to those of Anglo-Americans, their family structure, the characteristics of Mexican-American students, and "Chicano Power." Treatment of these areas is supplemented by detailed suggestions for coping with the student. These suggestions refer to determination of reading, spelling, and reasoning levels; overcoming the lack of true reinforcement of learning; development of a meaningful program within the established curriculum; maintenance of discipline; overcoming negative self concept; use of positive approaches; use of the cultural difference among students for the benefit of the students; communicating with the parents of students; and, expansion of curricula to include the culture, heritage, and other contributions of Mexican Americans. Also included in this guide are a list of recommended readings, a survey of Mexican history, a chronological outline of Mexican history, a select bibliography of Mexican history and culture, and sources for further information. (RJ)

ED041980

A Forgotten American:

A Resource Unit for Teachers on the Mexican American

by

Luis F. Hernandez

UD010458

Introduction by

Robert H. Finch

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

75¢

The work presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

1969

Table of Contents

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	5
BACKGROUND OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN	7
ACCULTURATION OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN	14
CONFLICT OF VALUES	17
THE FAMILY	20
THE MEXICAN AMERICAN STUDENT	25
CHICANO POWER	32
SUGGESTIONS TO THE TEACHER	35
RECOMMENDED READINGS	39
A SURVEY OF MEXICAN HISTORY	41
A CHRONOLOGICAL OUTLINE OF MEXICAN HISTORY	52
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MEXICAN HISTORY AND CULTURE	54
SOURCES OF INFORMATION	56

About the Author

Luis F. Hernandez, Assistant Professor of Education at San Fernando Valley State College and a Los Angeles public school teacher for more than a decade, is consultant to the Mexican American Studies program of the Los Angeles city schools.

Mr. Hernandez is the author of many publications dealing with the culturally disadvantaged, Mexican American history and the teaching of English to both Mexican American and Negro students. He is a member of the Social Science Association, the National Council of Teachers of English and the Mexican American Educators Association.

Introduction

"Christians by the Grace of God;
Gentlemen thanks to our Spanish Descent;
Noble Lords from our Indian Ancestry;
Mexicans by Pride and Tradition;"
And Americans by Destiny.
Thus, we are Mexican Americans . . .
Y No le Pedimos Nada a Nadie!
(And we ask nothing from no one!)
— adapted from a mural in Mexico City

These words describe the spirit of a people whose cultural contribution to the western hemisphere has yet to be fully measured. This spirit is manifested in our history, in our arts, and in our determination to solve the problems which face us as a Nation. Yet too few of the history books used in our schools say enough about Mexican American contributions to the development of our country.

Mexican Americans were at the forefront in settling the West. They labored in its fields, on its ranches, and in its villages, and they are now an increasing part of its large cities. They helped build railroads, irrigation systems, missions, and industry. Their search for civil and economic equality has been pursued with courage and conviction.

Despite poverty, rejection of their language, cultural conflict, and degrading segregation, Mexican American citizens have not turned their backs on America's premise nor its promise. Their dedication to the ideals of American democracy, their fierce loyalty to our country, their faith in the worth of ethnic diversity continue to strengthen the weave of values, customs, and traditions which are

the fabric of this Nation. The Mexican Americans I have known in both private and public capacities have enriched the lives of their associates with grace and simple dignity.

No history of our country can be either complete or true unless it accurately relates the roles of all our people in its evolution. This work and others in preparation or now beginning to appear will, in time, make very clear the enriching significance of our Mexican American heritage. May it guide students and teachers alike to this new awareness and appreciation.

ROBERT H. FINCH
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

Background of the Mexican American

What is a Mexican American? The answer to this question is as complex as the definition of what an American is. Indeed, Mexican Americans themselves find it difficult to define who they are. There are those who say, "I am an American of Mexican descent." Others say, "No, I am a Latin American," or ". . . a Spanish-speaking American," or ". . . a Spanish-surnamed American," or ". . . an American of Mexican parentage," or ". . . an American Mexican." Some may even call themselves "Mexican American without the hyphen." Still other terms exist, some more recent than others, such as *Chicano* or Brown People. Each term expresses a particular philosophy or an attitude regarding self-identification. To consider Mexican Americans a homogeneous group with a given set of characteristics and qualities is therefore to stereotype.

Further analysis of Mexican Americans in terms of location, origin, history and culture will lead to the insight and understanding that they are culturally distinct from the dominant society as regards language, customs, heritage, attitudes and values.

The majority of the nearly 4,000,000 Mexican Americans are to be found in the southwestern part of the United States, with the largest concentrations in Los Angeles and San Antonio. Yet large groups also live in Chicago, Detroit and Gary, Indiana. It is likewise significant to note that Mexican Americans vary from state to state, from community to community. The differences are based on local "in" and "out" attitudes, the economic resources and size of the community, whether it is rural or urban and whether the leadership is to be found on a local or state level.

The origin of the group is another major factor in determining the various ways in which Mexican Americans identify themselves. Some may be the descendants of the original settlers of an area, such

as the people in the Chama River valley in New Mexico, settled in 1598. A simple review of place names in the West and Southwest gives ample indication of the presence there of a Mexican American population dating back to the period of Spanish and Mexican exploration and settlement: San Francisco, Atascadero, Pecos River, Colorado River, Amarillo, Santa Fe, Los Alamos, Alamogordo, Nogales, Pueblo, San Joaquin Valley, Sacramento. (A closer study of the map also demonstrates a variance in the concentration of Spanish names. Thus, in Texas and Arizona there are fewer such names than in California or New Mexico, indicating that the former areas were not as attractive for settlement.) It is estimated that 1,333,000 Mexican Americans are descendants of Mexicans who were residents of the West and Southwest as far back as 1848.

Of the remaining 2,667,000 Mexican Americans most are recent migrants or else first- and second-generation Americans. There have been three large waves of migrants from Mexico, the first of which began in 1910 when that country went through its great political-social upheaval. The United States encouraged this immigration because of the need for agricultural labor created by World War I.

During the 1920's, there was a second wave of migration, again due to the political and economic insecurity of Mexico. It is estimated that, all told, nearly 1,000,000 Mexicans emigrated to the United States between 1910 and 1930.

After World War II a third group of migrants came to the United States, attracted once more by the agricultural labor market.

It must be understood that for a large number of Mexicans there has never been the cultural and psychological wrench generally associated with migration. Many simply consider it a "returning," an attitude which has existed among Mexicans for centuries. For example, early Mexican California families considered themselves to be residents of both California (Alta and Baja) as well as the Mexican states of Sonora or Sinaloa, and had land holdings equally divided among these areas. As a consequence, with the annexation of California by the United States in 1850, many of them considered that a political rather than a territorial differentiation had taken place. Today, too, Mexicans continue to hold this attitude. Many have residences on both sides of the border; many work in one country and live in the other, regardless of their nationality.

A broad study of Mexican history is imperative for a thorough understanding of the Mexican American. However, such a study is beyond the scope of this resource unit. (Instead, a short survey of Mexican history plus an outline at the end of this unit provide a summary background which can be expanded upon by the reader.) What we shall discuss here are those historical events which are of crucial importance in comprehending the differences that exist among Mexican Americans.

The first of such events is the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, signed on February 2, 1850, at the end of the Mexican-American War. As a result of this treaty Mexico acknowledged the annexation of Texas by the United States and ceded to the Americans the territory that is presently represented by California and most of Arizona and New Mexico. In addition, Mexican nationals were given one year to decide whether they wanted to move to Mexico, or remain in their homes and become citizens of the United States. Finally, along with the provision of citizenship, the treaty guaranteed the property rights of these nationals as well as freedom of religion and choice of language. (Incidentally, studies of the struggle of Mexican Americans to establish property rights, especially in California, reveal the names of unscrupulous Anglo-Americans who used their position to further themselves politically or materially. For further information, see *Decline of the Californios* by Leonard Pitt.)

The approximately 75,000 Mexicans who decided to remain and receive American citizenship were as varied a group as exists today in any area. However, they reflected those differences typical to Mexico, not to the United States; for built into their group was the system of social stratification that under Spanish rule had controlled Mexico for more than three hundred years.

If we picture this system as a pyramid, at the apex were the *peninsulares,* those individuals born in Spain who had come to the New World as government, religious or military leaders. This group, overthrown during the Mexican revolution for independence in 1821, was subsequently replaced by the *criollos,* or creoles, i.e., Mexican-born people of Spanish parents. The *criollos,* typifying all that was Spanish — physical appearance in particular — were truly "white," unless they had some Moorish blood. To all intent and purpose they became *la gente bien* (the people who are well off), *la gente de razon*

(the people who reason), *la gente decente* (the decent people) and *los quien mandan* (the people who command).

Mexicans of the highest social class owned large land holdings throughout the Southwest, particularly areas that were suited to cattle grazing or farming. When the Anglo-Americans began to move into these newly annexed areas, many of them married into Mexican families in order to secure land for development of new industries or expansion of old ones. In this way, they either inherited land or received large sections as dowry. (In this connection it is a matter of interest to note the number of Anglos who, when fiesta days come to their communities, point with pride to their Mexican ancestors. An even more striking phenomenon is that these ancestors, both Anglo *and* Mexican, become retrospectively more aristocratic with the passing of the years.)

Below the *criollos* were the *mestizos,* those of mixed Indian and Spanish blood, now popularly known as *La Raza.* The majority group, the *mestizos,* were established not only socially but economically. Though limited at first in terms of the areas of work or service they could enter, with the Mexican revolution their position greatly improved. A greater freedom was theirs; they could achieve higher social levels. Notwithstanding this, a great deal was dependent on their appearance and coloring; obviously it was easier for *el blanco* (the white) to "make it" than for *el moreno* (the dark one).

Below the *mestizo* was the lowest class, the Indian — the *indio,* the *indigeno.* The Indian, together with the uneducated or impoverished *mestizo,* were the laborers, the soldiers, the artisans, the *vaqueros* (cowboys) in the class system, and vertical movement on the social scale was difficult for them. Yet the Indian was able to look down upon the Negro, who by 1850 had been nearly completely assimilated into the *Indian* and *mestizo* groups.

(During the period of Spanish rule there had been one other grouping, the *zambo,* a mixture of Negro and Indian. But by the nineteenth century this sub-stratum had vanished.)

The significant fact implicit in the foregoing discussion is that social stratification was basic to Mexican culture and that, when the Southwest became part of the United States, this aspect of Mexican culture was an accompanying element. (In fact, some Mexican Americans still place value on one's social position, skin coloring and type

of employment.) Yet class lines were not so markedly drawn as they were in the large cities of Mexico itself. After all, the Southwest bordered on Mexico and, as on any frontier, a great many differences could be overlooked and certain conventions of prejudice modified.

Another event in Mexican history which played a key role in the development of the Mexican-American was the Mexican revolution of 1910-1922. During this period there was a mass migration of Mexicans to the United States. Many were political refugees, but the majority came as displaced people who had been victimized by the fast-changing governments and the indiscriminate destruction wreaked by the armies of the revolution.

Those immigrants who came as political refugees generally represented *la gente bien,* i.e., they were educated and accustomed to living well. A number of them managed to escape with some material wealth which sustained them for a time. Once having decided to remain in the United States (probably because the world they once knew was gone), they were able to integrate into the dominant society because of their education and financial means. At the same time, they retained a pride in their Mexican heritage.

As for the displaced people who came to the United States during this period, they sought asylum and a new hope for the future. They offered little in terms of skill, other than manual; they were handicapped by unfamiliarity with the English language, and they had little formal education. Many, too, were experiencing urban living for the first time.

Both groups, however, had one thing in common — at least in the beginning: they felt their residency in the United States was a temporary one. Therefore, they clung to those aspects of Mexican culture that reinforced their Mexican identity, and this slowed down their assimilation into the dominant culture.

During this period, which just predates World War I, the United States had expanded the agricultural industry of the Southwest. The demands of the war coupled with the resultant curtailment of European and Oriental immigrant labor led to the opening up of the Mexican border. The minimal qualifications regarding literacy and health required for entry into the United States diminished as the labor shortage increased, thus bringing into this country thousands of workers from the farming areas of Mexico. It was these laborers

who established the great agricultural industry of the San Joaquin, Imperial, Salt River, Mesella and lower Rio Grande Valleys. (A close study of the growth of the agricultural, mining and railroad industries of the Southwest inspires one with an appreciation not only of the fortitude of these people but of their contribution to the rapid progress of these areas.)

This migration came to a halt during the Great Depression. In order to alleviate the pressures created by unemployment, the government adopted the simple and cheap expediency of deporting Mexican laborers. Federal, state and local agencies sent carloads of them back to Mexico. In thousands of cases, their legal rights were overlooked, and, in the enforced exodus, many who were United States citizens by right of birth were summarily deported. The criterion that was generally used was one of visual identification or stereotype.

1940 to the present represents yet another period of immigration, with agricultural labor being the main attraction. In recognizing the importance of such labor to the U.S.A., the two countries signed an agreement, popularly called *Los Braceros Program,* which brought to the United States thousands of Mexican nationals. Thousands of other Mexicans have waded across the Rio Grande (such action being the origin of the term "wetbacks") and entered this country illegally. In either case, both groups have come seeking enough money to make it possible for them, on their return to Mexico, to improve their socio-economic position.

What is important to understand here is not the details of this latest migration (although they play a role in shaping the attitudes many Mexicans have developed toward Anglos), but the fact that the migration has provided a constant reinforcement of Mexican culture. The majority of Mexican laborers who enter the United States legally come with limited education, skills or language ability, which places them at a great disadvantage in terms of assimilation into the mainstream. These same limitations force them to cluster together in communities (*barrios* or *colonias*) which, instead of offering them new experiences, only reinforce the culture they have brought with them.

From this rather brief analysis, certain broad generalities about Mexican Americans emerge. These can be summarized as follows:

1. Mexican Americans are a heterogeneous group.
2. Mexican Americans have a strong heritage that reflects Spanish influence.
3. Many Mexican Americans are descendants of original settlers of the West and Southwest.
4. The proximity of Mexico has provided a labor market for the United States.
5. The growth of many industries in the Southwest has been due to Mexican labor.
6. There has been a constant migration of Mexicans to the United States, especially since 1910.
7. Most migrants have come to the United States as laborers.
8. Most migrants reflect a strong rural background.
9. The limited skills and educational background of the migrant have worked against his assimilation.
10. The migrants' limited knowledge of English has forced them to cluster together in communities — *barrios* or *colonias*.
11. Living in *barrios* or *colonias* has provided a constant reinforcement of Mexican culture and values.

Acculturation of the Mexican American

As we have seen, the Mexican American cannot be accurately described, because in any attempt to describe him a stereotype is created. Therefore, it is perhaps best to consider him in terms of the degree of his acculturation.

In the Mexican-American community there are many stages of acculturation. A useful way to describe these phases accurately is to view the community as a continuum. On one extreme are those individuals or families recently arrived from Mexico. They reflect most strongly Mexican attitudes and behavior, and speak only Spanish. (Groups recently arriving from other parts of the Southwest reflect less "very Mexican" behavior and custom patterns and speak different levels of Spanish or English.) On the other hand, as we move away from the Mexican end of the continuum, we find that each individual or family demonstrates increasing degrees of acculturation, has gained a knowledge of English and that the attitudes and behavior patterns are more consistent with those of the dominant Anglo culture.

Most Mexicans of a low socio-economic level are from rural areas, whether they reside in the United States or in Mexico. As a result they have developed those characteristics generally common to rural people. Thus they are reluctant to accept change, clinging tightly to those attitudes and behavior patterns which give them a feeling of security in the face of situations which tend to point up their inadequacies. Likewise, they generally have limited experience in civic affairs, and find little need to be involved in community functions or business. Not only do they tend to consider such activities as unnecessary, but they do not thoroughly understand their role in the community and the accompanying responsibilities that go along with being members of that community. Finally, organization as it exists and is defined in the dominant culture is not a part of their perspective.

Instead, they are strongly independent and behave in a "lone" manner unless something arises which they look upon as threatening to the status quo. On such occasions they act as a group, until once again the status quo is established; then they return to the independent existence of loners.

The need for an individual to be able to act independently is particularly fostered in Mexican culture, and such an ability is viewed as a sign of strength of character. Inevitably, there is anxiety about losing one's identity in a mass or group, with the result that individuality is many times confused with individualism.

The Mexican-American community has a tacit awareness of its own isolation. Years of such awareness have taught its members the methods and techniques necessary to avoid feelings of inadequacy. Many of these self-protective mechanisms have been labeled and used by the dominant culture to describe the Mexican American as *complacent, passive, indifferent.*

That such labeling is fallacious is proven more and more each day by the strikes of militant farm laborers, the establishment of Head Start and self-help programs, attendance at night school, student walkouts, and aggressive action on the part of the Brown Berets.[1]

Even more, the upsurge in the civil rights movements and the increasing number of educated and successful Mexican Americans are erasing any such stereotyping. In fact, they are and always have been interested in education, in achievement, in equal opportunity, in labor conditions, in politics, in contributing to the community and to the country.

Unfortunately, the tools necessary to attain equal standing in such ventures have not always been at their disposal. There have been handicaps dating back to a period of history when the dominant culture first began to impose its attitudes and values on the Mexican American. Rarely, too, has the dominant society exerted itself to try to understand and respect the fact that the values and attitudes of the Mexican are different, not inferior — DIFFERENT.

True enough, many immigrant groups to the United States have gone through similar experiences and similar patterns of acculturation. But these groups, which have created the great meld that is the

[1] Brown Berets are a small, highly militant group originating in Los Angeles who strongly advocate Brown Power. Their wearing of Brown Berets has become symbolic of their Brown Power ideals.

American society, have ultimately taken unto themselves Anglo culture and Anglo identity. And, while many Mexicans have done the same, yet there remain several million who have not gained that degree of acculturation and who are culturally "different." Due partially to a low socio-economic level and partially to the constant reinforcement of Mexican culture, this group's movement across the continuum is slow. However, just as all immigrant groups have found that acculturation becomes more rapid once its socio-economic level has improved, so too will the Mexican American.

From the foregoing discussion we may draw these generalities by way of summary:

1. Mexican Americans are at different stages of acculturation.
2. Total assimilation rarely takes place at a low socio-economic level.
3. Most Mexican Americans of a low socio-economic level are of rural origin.
4. Rural people generally:
   a. are reluctant to change
   b. have limited experience in civic or business affairs
   c. tend to be very independent and self-sufficient, even to the point of becoming loners
   d. retain their sense of individuality.
5. Mexican Americans have developed a number of self-protective mechanisms.
6. Many Mexican Americans have values and attitudes that are different from those of the Anglo-American.
7. Acculturation takes place more rapidly once the socio-economic level is raised.

Conflict of Values

Any attempt to understand Mexican Americans depends upon recognition of the fact that they possess a set of values different from those of Anglo-Americans. It is this difference in values that constantly creates misunderstanding, resulting in lack of empathy for, sensitivity toward, and acceptance of the Mexican American. Some teachers try to compensate for these differences in values by imposing on their students values that reflect their own personal background. However, such teachers are inevitably at a disadvantage, for, in the imposition of their own values, they are implying that they do not recognize Mexican American culture as an entity or consider it worthy of recognition. Consequently they cannot expect success with their teaching.

It has already been shown that Mexican Americans are heterogeneous; that most of them are rural in origin; that they vary in their stage of acculturation. Therefore, any study of their values must be based on the premise that the degree to which these values are reflected in their lives is dependent on their stage of acculturation and individual differences.

The value system characteristic of most Mexican Americans is based on the development of Mexican rural society. It follows, then, that many of these values are traceable to Spanish tradition and the social caste system developed by the Spaniards in their New World colonies, an analysis of which has already been presented.

Spanish Catholicism played an important part in the development of attitudes of fatalism and resignation. In addition, the rural people's closeness to the land, which led to greater awareness of the capriciousness of nature and man's dependency on natural phenomena beyond his control, also fed the development of such attitudes.

Closely tied to religion is authority or leadership, another factor which shaped cultural values. Many decisions or directions were based on interpretations received or learned in the church. Leadership came as well from those members of the family who were in authority.

But what carried the greatest weight was the *patron system*. This system had been established by the Spaniards during the period of colonization and remained in force until recent times. The system depended on a paternalistic boss who made decisions and gave direction; thus laborers rarely had an opportunity for democratic decision-making. Similarly, the social positions created by this boss-worker relationship were seldom altered; therefore, there was little opportunity for change. What adjustments were made in this relationship were almost invariably on a personal basis.

Since most Mexicans were rural in origin, they lived in some degree of isolation. This isolation limited social intercourse which in turn limited cultural exchange. Many aspects of the industrial revolution were late in reaching the rural areas, and major social changes took place very slowly. Instead, there continued to be a consistent reinforcement of the traditional way of life.

This traditionalism helped create a society in which innovation was not important, a society which did not progress or plan for the future. In short, things were the way they were always going to be.

The basic skills of reading and writing were largely absent from this society, for there was no need for them in maintaining the status quo. Furthermore, education was hard to come by in most rural communities.

Isolation and traditional living made for a greater emphasis on the family unit as the source of security and emotional satisfaction. Living in these isolated communities made for an uncomplicated daily pattern, and the various roles that an individual played in such a community were few in number.

Even less complicated was the attitude toward time. To the rural Mexican, there was simply a season for one thing and a season for another. A day's work was regulated by the amount of light available. Some jobs were to be done today, others tomorrow.

In communities of this kind there were some tasks, of course, that required a given skill. That skill was carefully passed from father to son, and it was generally understood that both the skill and the attendant tools were the property of one person or family. However, most families were nonetheless quite self-sufficient. In these communities, people asked, "Quién es?" (Who *are* you?) not "Qué hace?" (What do you do?). In other words, the emphasis was on *being*, not doing.

Though the above is an over-simplification of Mexican rural society, it does make easy the contrast between Mexican-American and Anglo-American values.

Mexican-American values can be said to be directed toward tradition, fatalism, resignation, strong family ties, a high regard for authority, paternalism, personal relations, reluctance to change, a greater orientation to the present than to the future and a greater concern for being than doing.

The contrasting Anglo-American values can be said to be directed toward change, achievement, impersonal relations, efficiency, progress, equality, scientific rationalization, democracy, individual action and reaction and a greater concern for doing than being.

These contrasting values can be broken down into the following conflicts:

Rural *vs.* urban
Isolation *vs.* cultural exchange
Slow *vs.* rapid social and scientific change
Personal *vs.* impersonal association
Authoritarian *vs.* democratic action
Simple *vs.* complex labor relations
Established dependence *vs.* independence
Sacred *vs.* secular emphasis
Concern for the present *vs.* concern for the future
Set social organization *vs.* social mobility.

It must be emphasized again that this is only a cursory evaluation of Mexican values. When the rural Mexican immigrates to the United States, he brings these values with him, and it is these values which come into conflict with those of the Anglo-American. It must also be reiterated that the degree of conflict is determined by the individual's place on the continuum of acculturation.

The Family

Knowledge of the Mexican-American family structure provides an insight into many problems which may be faced by teachers in the classroom, such as the absence of either interest or desire to be involved in school, shown by both parent and student; student dependency on being told *what* to do and *how* to do it; an overall lack of initiative; truancy from school, and so forth.

Vastly more than the school, the family unit provides a foundation for the Mexican-American youngster of emotional and material security that remains with him through his entire life. Therefore, the family will always come first. The family gives the Mexican American a sense of being — an identity. Once this fact is understood by the teacher, he will at the same time understand that school then is not a stage in the Mexican-American youngster's life so much as a means toward an end. It means, too, that many concepts and organizations originating in the school, such as P.T.A., school clubs, school spirit and so forth, are Anglo-American middle-class values, and as such have little meaning to the Mexican-American youngster — at least until he has progressed well across the continuum of acculturation.

At this point, a brief discussion of the basic organization of a Mexican-American family is in order. The organization is patriarchal. The father is the head of the family and is the ultimate authority. He is the provider; he establishes his position in the family and the community by how well he provides. Traditionally, all men are considered to be superior to women. A girl looks forward to the day she will fulfill her role as a woman through motherhood. As a mother she then becomes the center of the home, where her first duty is to serve her husband. On her shoulders fall the responsibilities of raising the children. The boys are brought up to emulate the father, the girls to follow in the mother's pattern. Thus, there is an early division of labor within the home based on sex differences, which makes for certain work that is done only by a woman, and work that is done only by a man.

In addition, in most Mexican families there is the so-called extended family, which may consist of grandparents, maiden aunts, unmarried males or *compadres*. (*Compadres* are individuals who have earned a place in the family through any one of innumerable reasons.)

The family is a sanctuary; it is strength; it is identification. As such, the family comes before the individual. A Mexican or Mexican American is thought of first as a Gonzalez or a Sanchez, and only secondly as a Francisco or a Dolores.

In the process of acculturation, many families undergo circumstances which upset or seriously disrupt this orderly pattern. Often the father is unable to provide an income that will support such a structure, and the mother must go to work. In such a situation, the father's *machismo* (maleness) suffers and his role as head of the family becomes nominal. At the same time, the mother, with the new importance that she achieves as a contributor to the family income, begins to take on a more dominant role in family decision-making. As for the children, they are more and more unsupervised, and gradually lose the sense of security in the home and of parental control and authority. Thus the entire traditional structure inevitably collapses. To the teacher, seeking to understand causes for certain student behavior, such disintegration of the family unit provides explanations for absenteeism, failure to come to class prepared, lack of cleanliness, poor health, emotional disturbances, early dropouts, etc.

Each youngster mirrors the degree of acculturation of his family, most noticeably in his mastery of language. Though the majority of Mexican-American youngsters are bilingual, the level of bilinguality varies with their position on the continuum. If a student is on the Mexican end of the continuum, he is expected by his family to speak Spanish in the home. This expectation, and even insistence, reduces the reinforcement of English he is learning in school. Generally, a youngster from such a family has a more limited vocabulary in both languages than many of his peers, and his speech and pronunciation are adversely affected. Naturally, these handicaps have an adverse effect on such basic language skills as comprehension, speaking, listening, reading and writing.

As a corollary to the above, children of such background tend to demonstrate attitudes and behavior patterns that are basically Mexican in origin. Among these may be particular attitudes regarding time, the

importance of an academic education, personal reaction to the teacher, and so forth. As for the parents of this group they have a great tendency to expect more from the school than the school may be capable of doing. They have no real understanding of the process of education. They feel that learning takes place by magic. They find it difficult to understand why their child "hasn't learned anything — he can't do anything — he can't earn a living yet and he's been in school ten years." Many times these parents also oppose concepts that their youngster learn in school. Instead, they fall back on a practical approach to problems based on their personal experience and resist the theoretical, conceptual or academic approach taught in the schools.

The parents' general attitude towards their youngster when he enters high school is more formal and authoritarian. The father is especially intolerant of "deviations in behavior," and the parental solution to such behavior (which is seen as reflecting on parental control and authority) is the use of corporal punishment. However, this punishment becomes especially difficult to administer to mature boys who are aware of their manhood — their being *macho*.

Often parents stimulate their youngsters to efforts to raise the family level through socio-economic gains. But many times this encouragement proves ultimately detrimental to the family unit, for it demands a greater acculturation on the part of the youngsters. Parents do not realize that the loss of some of the basic Mexican identity is part of the price of such acculturation, while certain young people who acculturate rapidly and identify with the dominant culture find they are increasingly embarrassed by their parents' provincialism.

Mexican-American youth is often burdened by this effort to straddle two cultures. On the other hand, parents who fear either loss of identity and authority or who are not ready to accept the "new ways" do not hesitate to instill feelings of guilt in their children.

It is obvious, then, that youngsters in a state of transition from one culture to another carry many burdens which directly affect their role in the classroom. Their progress is slowed by minimal reinforcement of classroom learning in the home; lack of understanding on the part of parents for school activities which go beyond that of learning; forced decisions in terms of a career or future when there are no clearly defined points of reference, or where high achievement is unreasonably expected by parents who do not or cannot provide an

environment which is conducive to building proper study skills; and by the guilty realization that, instead of studying, they should perhaps be contributing materially to relieving the pressures created by the low incomes of their parents.

Knowledge of these encumbrances on the part of a school staff should lead eventually to viable programs to relieve the situation. These should include teacher sensitivity to the lack of home participation in school activities, to an awareness of the lack of motivation of many students, and to the reasons for their dropping out of school. Teachers must learn to accept the limited development of student study skills as a logical outcome of limited space, materials and equipment for study.

The size of the Mexican-American family is a major factor that must also be considered when working with students. In large families with low incomes the oldest child carries the burden of home responsibility at a very early age, and parents generally expect them to contribute to the family income. (This contribution may be in the form of supplying their own clothing and "extras.") In situations where one parent is absent, for whatever reason, the premature responsibility that falls on the eldest becomes easily evident, either through the student's attendance record or his dropping out altogether. Often girls in their early teens manage a whole household, while boys of a similar age may be expected to fill the vacancy left by the absent father — a role for which they have no preparation or training. Nonetheless, prepared or not, the youngster is the head of the house.

The value that education has for the Anglo-American is not the same for the Mexican American. To the latter, it may offer a way out from a future of low status such as his parents had. Because the Mexican-American youngster often has this expectation, he expects that the effects of an education will be immediately perceptible. He wants rapid results. When the fruits of education are slow in coming, he becomes impatient, frustrated and tends either to consider school valueless, or to blame himself for lack of success. This attitude is a commonplace among most disadvantaged groups. Clearly, the implication exists as to the necessity for providing a classroom situation that will in some way be applicable to the youngster's need — especially in terms of content, certainly in terms of opportunity for achievement. In other words, Mexican-American youngsters must taste the fruits of success often.

One should not conclude this section without pointing out that the needs of many Mexican-American youngsters are even more complex than those mentioned above. Generally, they stem from interpersonal kinds of problems — problems quite separate from either the community or the family. In addition to being culturally different, they also carry the pains and sorrows that accompany growth and development. Puberty in any culture is not without its traumas. These youngsters also are subject to all the other variables that exist in any classroom situation, such as the ability spectrum, health, family crises, physical appearance, etc. For the Mexican-American youngster, these factors are exaggerated because of the inevitable comparison and contrast with the Anglo-American enclave in the public schools.

The Mexican-American Student

In discussing in some detail the Mexican-American student, it is necessary to keep in mind that the Anglo-American attitude towards education is quite different from that of the Mexican American. To the former, school is not only a necessity, it plays an integral role in the development of the individual. For him, the school is an extension of the home; consequently, the teachers and the staff of the school are surrogate parents. This situation is established by law, for at a given age a child must begin formal education, and his parent has the responsibility of supporting the school — actively through school-parent organizations, or tacitly through other means. Parents' wishes are respected in that parents are expected to approve or disapprove of the educational direction taken by the school. Thus, Anglo-American education is basically a joint venture between the home and the school.

A cursory review of the curriculum of an average school in the United States will indicate the great number of courses and extra-curricular activities that are sponsored in order to provide for personal growth, competence and character building. Yet, at the same time, it is accepted by the majority of parents that a public school education does not necessarily signify that the young graduate is either capable of sustaining himself or of contributing to the family income. In fact, these same parents freely acknowledge that further education of a specialized nature is required for their children.

To the Mexican American of minimal acculturation, school is hardly an extension of the home. Rather, it is a place where one learns to read, to write, to do numbers. It is also generally expected that a youngster, after a given period of time in school, will have had enough education in order to be able to sustain himself and contribute to the family income. In the traditional patriarchal pattern of the Mexican American home, the lessons and guidance required for personal growth and character-building are provided *within* the family unit; the school's province is development of competence.

Mexican-American parents tend to have the vague belief that a "good" basic education in the fundamental academic courses is all

the formal training necessary to achieve status. Therefore, many of the extracurricular activities or "frill classes" offered by schools seem quite valueless to the Mexican-American parents who have only their personal experience and background as a point of reference.

Education to these parents is, nevertheless, important for they have enough experience to understand that their social position is determined to a large degree by the lack of that type of education essential to upward social mobility. Actually, therefore, they are ambitious for their children; rarely does a parent want his offspring to follow in his footsteps. But many Mexican-American parents are confused and unable to communicate these feelings or attitudes. They want to support the school but are unable to do so; to them the school is a foreign world — an Anglo world. Because of their inability to communicate, they find themselves many times in conflict with the school and its staff. The feelings that go with such conflicts are then transmitted to the children, and this situation, of course, places the children in the middle of a contest between two authorities. Similarly, most school-parent activities are completely alien to them, for, rather than encouraging participation, these activities evoke an opposite reaction in them. In their minds the nature and mechanics of these activities only serve to point up their inadequacies and shortcomings.

The foregoing should help bring into focus a large number of characteristics which, in varying degrees, relate directly to Mexican-American students and the consequent implications for the teacher. Many of these, as in other instances heretofore, are determined by the position of the youngster on the continuum of acculturation.

Mexican-American students are of five general types:

1. Students who are more Anglo than Mexican, and who speak more English than Spanish.
2. Students who are more Mexican than Anglo and speak more Spanish than English.
3. Students who are about half Mexican and half Anglo: they speak a hodge-podge which is known in some Mexican communities as *pocho*.
4. Students who speak absolutely no English and are Mexican in all senses of the word.
5. Migrant students who could be any of the above, but generally are of the fourth type.

It is important to analyze each of these groups so that we may better understand that a teacher may have five distinctly different teaching situations in a single classroom.

Students who are more Anglo than Mexican comprise the group the teacher can most easily comprehend, and can most easily teach, with the expectation of finding less frustration and more satisfaction than with the other groups. Yet this group includes many members who are taciturn or laconic, and who are easily labeled "not interested" or "lacking in initiative." They evidence a limited amount of responses to the teacher's efforts and energy. Many are several years behind in reading level, and have writing and spelling skills that are "impossible," but they may be reflecting an attitude rather than an inability to learn. By the time these students have reached the ninth or tenth grade they tend to assess their future prospects in negative terms. "Where do we go from *here*?" they often ask. This attitude is strongly reinforced by a decrease in their school progress which generally sets in in the seventh grade. Teachers see no logical explanation for such retrogression or lack of progress which manifests itself in reading ability, comprehension, spelling and vocabulary. Yet it takes place. The explanation is not to be found in the school alone; it is rooted also in the reality of a tomorrow without meaning or purpose.

The problem, therefore, is a socio-psychological one: the school is not meeting the student's needs, as the student or his parents see them outlined; the school offers no guarantees. Instead, what the student is being offered in terms of academic and vocational subject matter is wholly irrelevant to his needs; so why should he participate? In any case, he rarely has parental support since he most likely comes from a home that holds itself aloof from the school, and in which his parents have feelings of inadequacy in terms of being able to express their needs. Such parents have yet to accept the school as *the* tool for educating their children; they do not understand why it is their youngster does not succeed, and the child is unable to explain his failure to them. The fact is that the school has taught him failure; it has not taught him success. And lack of success creates more failure, which is anyhow the end expected both by student and teacher.

With the second Mexican-American group, the teacher encounters situations which have a more sociological than academic base. In this

group, the student reflects strong home ties and a culture that to the majority of Anglo teachers is so different from what they are familiar with that they find it difficult to accept. Thus, the student is either the first in his family to be born in the United States or the first to have settled permanently in a community. The initial five or six years of his life have been spent in a tight family unit. Spanish is his first language, while his very limited experience with the English language generally is acquired in school. By "very limited" we mean that such a student is not really taught English in the elementary grades, but instead is taught to read and write a language which, unlike the American student, he does not speak. In other words, he is offered the same materials and subject matter as any other student — this procedure being predicated on the assumption that *all* students bring certain basic (i.e., Anglo) knowledge to school which the teacher can use as a foundation to build on. Among other things, a given vocabulary is expected of them. This assumption is false, and therefore they have unwarrantedly been moved along from grade to grade simply in order to avoid too gross a disparity between their age and intellectual development, or else they may have been retained in one grade so long that they are forced to question their intellectual ability. (Many, too, have already been labeled as slow learners because of poor achievement scores, scores which are based on tests developed for average Anglo children.) So that by the time these students have reached the middle grades not only is their self-image low, but they have become taciturn or laconic, without initiative or creativity.

The third group, students who are about half Mexican and half Anglo, is the most difficult for Anglos as well as many Mexican Americans of the other groups to understand and accept. It is a group which is pulled in two directions, one which awkwardly straddles two cultures. On the one hand, students reject many aspects of being Mexican, but at the same time hold on to certain others, for they have no real identity as Anglos. When they try to adopt, and adapt to, certain Anglo characteristics, they find they are rejected, for they lack the experience of sophistication to "pull it off." Repeated rejections or the anticipation of rejection soon place them in a situation where they realize they have no identity at all; and, without an identity, they of course have no real place. These youngsters cannot understand their dilemma; they do not comprehend why, for them, identity and assimilation are mutually exclusive. So, by way of reaction,

they become a group unto themselves, a group with their own ways, dress and language.

The fourth group, students who speak no English and who are in every way Mexican, doesn't really belong in the regular classroom at all, but in a class that provides for the teaching of English as a *second* language. Nonetheless, in most schools, such students are found in the regular classroom because of the lack of other facilities. Inevitably, they create a most difficult situation for the teacher who is already over-challenged by the other three groups who, in turn, are themselves defeated even before they begin to learn.

Migrant students can fall into any of the four groups described above. In addition to the particular problems ascribed to each of these groups, they have the problem created by a continuously interrupted education which involves a constant repetition of "the beginning." Rarely do they meet any opportunity for guidance or find any provision made for individual differences.

This analysis of the various groups into which Mexican Americans can be divided has indicated that there are certain handicaps which any Mexican-American youngster has and which narrow his avenues to successful achievement in the classroom. To recapitulate, among them are:

1. A limited familiarity with the English language.
2. A poor self-image.
3. A lack of motivation.
4. An absence of awareness on the part of teachers of his handicaps and cultural differentiation.
5. A minimum amount of communication between his school and his home.
6. Poor scores on tests that do not take into account the differences in his cultural background.
7. Having parents who lack a real understanding of what his school environment is like.

To the above list should also be added the fact that, compared with Anglos, the Mexican American is poorly prepared for the demands school will make on him. This "lag" demonstrates itself quite sharply in his having a limited English vocabulary, which in turn affects his comprehension, reading and writing. However, the Mexican-American student does have experiences which an aware and interested teacher can tap and use. After all, young people of whatever

ethnic background have not developed in a vacuum; they are not totally culturally disadvantaged. They have merely been deprived of materials and methodology that make allowances for their cultural differences.

If the average Anglo teacher who deals with Mexican-American youngsters is to work successfully with them, he must face the fact that he has certain attitudes, predetermined by his own background, which need adaptation to certain basic concepts applying to Mexican Americans. The following are a few points such a teacher should keep in mind:

(a) Competition fosters achievement

If a Mexican-American boy or girl is observed on the athletic field, it is impossible to say he is non-competitive. But *in the classroom* that boy or girl changes. In this more formal surrounding, the origin of the youngster prevails over his acculturation. Mexican Americans are generally a humble people; to call too much attention to oneself is not considered proper. So, in *certain* situations, the youngster does not compete. What must also be weighed in judging this question of competitive spirit is that these youngsters may have a language handicap, or they may feel that they are not adequately prepared for the challenge of the classroom. In any competition, one enters with the idea of winning; but many of these youngsters have a long history of minimum success in the academic world. In observing pre-school or primary school Mexican Americans, one may notice humbleness and shyness, but one does not see a lack of competitiveness. The latter comes only after many years of very limited classroom success.

(b) All students must plan for the future

A middle-class Mexican American plans as carefully for the future as any middle-class Anglo-American. It is a recognized concept that the higher the social status of an individual, the more extensive will be his time orientation. Since most Mexican Americans belong to the lower socio-economic levels of American society, their time orientation is focused more on the present than the future. This can particularly be seen if we examine the question of reward expectation and self-projection. Mexican-American students from low socio-economic backgrounds respond more readily to immediate rewards than to those that are projected in terms of an ultimate goal in the distant future. Not only do they have difficulty projecting themselves into the far future, but they do not get a great deal of home support

for plans projecting into such a future. Parents strongly indicate that they want an education for their children, yet they do very little to discourage drop-outs. This disparity once again emphasizes the need for more adequate communication between the school and the home; in order for these young people to be educated for better living, they must develop a broader time orientation. And, for this, the home can play a crucial role.

(c) High ambition encourages achievement

A parallel can be drawn between time orientation and aspiration level. Mexican-American youngsters, who are socio-economically on a superior level and who are fairly well-educated, tend to have high aspiration levels and generally will find the means for attaining their goal. The real problem is with the youngster who is poor and has experienced little academic success in school, and as a consequence does not know what to aspire toward. Generally he can expect to receive little home support, even if he were to have high aspirations. The reality of what today is is much stronger than the reality of what a distant tomorrow may hold. In fact, even to dare to conceive of a tomorrow, one must feel secure in *the today*.

(d) Faint heart never won . . . anything

Middle-class Mexican Americans are as aggressive, in the best sense of that word, as their middle-class Anglo-American counterparts, and just as bright and capable. They have learned the language, as well as all the nuances and subtleties of Anglo-American culture. However, the Mexican-American child on the lower end of the continuum finds that he has a great deal to learn; that much of the Anglo culture is foreign to him. He realizes that he is different, that he is part of a minority. And, while he understands those situations which place him at a great disadvantage, he is not capable of coping with them. In school these youngsters often have experienced ridicule, failure and discrimination; therefore, they tend to develop self-protective defenses, which is reflected in an overall attitude that can be termed "timidity."

An Anglo-American teacher working with Mexican-American youngsters must be introspective enough to be able to analyze himself, to understand the situation he faces and to be aware of certain attitudes he may have which set him apart from the students in his classroom. In addition, the willing teacher must be able to see the reality outside himself, and accept and understand his Mexican-American students.

Chicano Power

The present-day Mexican American can be described as being in a stage of upheaval, an upheaval which has taken much of its inspiration from the civil rights movement. Perhaps the major consequence of this recent development has been to give to the leaders within the various Mexican-American communities of the Southwest (the majority of whom are young) the courage to voice their dissatisfaction with the inequalities, discrimination and lack of status which have been the lot of the Mexican American for the last hundred years. These leaders have found that an organized community has a strong voice which can be heard not only in the legislative chambers, but also in the caucus room of political parties.

Mexican-American leadership has taken many forms — from extreme conservative to extreme radical. There are those who advocate compromise, expecting that a slow and gradual recognition of the Mexican American will lead to his eventual assimilation. There are those, too, who can envision a day when Mexican-American identity will be recognized and accepted, without its necessarily being conditional to the assimilation of Mexican Americans. Some groups work for the complete and immediate overhauling of those areas which are responsible for discrimination and inequality. Still others express their determined purpose by joining forces with highly militant Negro groups. In fact, these last have gone so far as to establish a color rather than a cultural identity: the Brown People.

Because, as has been pointed out, the Mexican-American community is segmented into many groups, each with a slightly different interpretation of what a Mexican American is, it is not surprising that the name or label each group gives itself (or another group) reflects this difference in interpretation. However, there is one label which only a generation ago was considered by some as being disparaging and has now come to have general acceptance — *Chicano*. Since education is patently the key to change in social status, education

has been the focal point of most Chicano groups.

The increase in the number of Mexican Americans who have attained an education, have achieved success and are returning to the community (if not to live, at least to serve) has swelled the number of leaders and authoritative voices. Many have attained their education through the G.I. Bill. Thus, what could never have been done by an individual or his family has been done through federal aid — but only after military service is completed.

At the same time, a new feeling of personal worth has arisen among Mexican-American youth, especially those in the larger urban communities. To be a Chicano is to be not only of Mexican descent but, more important, it is to be an American. As Americans, Chicanos have a place within the national community. They are a determining factor in the economic market, on the political scene, on the military front. This new sense of worth has given them the strength to demand changes in an educational system that has not yet considered either their individual differences, or the difference in their needs and those of their Anglo-American counterparts. To them, the school is a foreign enclave in their community, an established system that has imposed itself on that community. Recent student walkouts clearly show the new character of Mexican-American youngsters that is developing. An analysis of their grievances and demands demonstrates that they have insight into their problems, and are thoroughly cognizant of their own shortcomings and handicaps. Of greater consequence, still, is that they do not want to be isolated; that they want to be contributing members to the constant development and progress of American society.

These youngsters have quickly learned to use the many tools developed by the other great minority, the Blacks, in achieving change. Close communication with the school as well as with the local community brings immediate knowledge of the young people's activities. In addition, they employ "underground" newspapers, form student organizations on college and high school levels and participate in group action such as picketing, marches, political rallies. More and more, these young people are upsetting the stereotype of what a Mexican American is.

A great awakening has likewise taken place among young Mexican-American parents who are not willing to settle for the same education for their children that they received. Their children, they feel, must

be better prepared than they were to cope with the problems and handicaps created by their cultural difference. These parents fully realize the disadvantages created by not having a greater command of the English language. They also understand the gap created by a cultural lag. It is these parents who participate actively in Head Start programs.

Adults who have lived under the disadvantages of not having been properly prepared vocationally are attending adult education programs in even greater numbers. Others are seeking a better knowledge of the English language. Increasingly, there is a feeling in Mexican American communities that all its citizens must have a more active role in determining their future. In short, the people are developing a broader time orientation.

The preceding has many implications for teachers. In a time of change, not all members of the community are necessarily involved in the change. Once again the prime determinant of mobility is the place the individual occupies on the continuum of acculturation. Movement across this continuum may well be faster because of current legislation that provides beneficial innovations, such as bilingual education. Likewise, new programs at secondary and college levels, sponsored by federal aid, take into account the cultural differences of the Mexican American.

The teachers' contribution to bringing about this change can take many forms. They may make adjustments within established curricula that clearly provide for cultural differences. They may leave the confines of the school altogether and step into the community. They may strengthen language skills. They can adopt new methods of teaching that do not violate the basic principles of learning — i.e., first comprehension, then speaking, then reading, and finally writing.

The forces which have motivated the Mexican American in the direction of change, or "Chicano Power," cannot be dismissed. It is therefore the responsibility of all involved to accept the change, to encourage the development of the individual, and most of all to understand that the Chicano wants and intends to play his role as he best sees it.

Suggestions to the Teacher

1. The teacher should determine the reading, spelling and reasoning levels of his Mexican-American students. Such an evaluation could consist of reading a short story aloud to the class and then asking students to select from a choice of words written on the board those which best describe what the story is about. During this period of testing, the teacher must be alert to the student who cannot write down these words without first consulting his neighbor or his neighbor's work. Another test of student ability can be given after the teacher has become familiar with the special patterns of certain students. Completely an individual type of evaluation, it consists of inconspicuously approaching a child and, through conversation, assessing his understanding of subject matter, directions, general vocabulary and American idiomatic expression.
2. Most Mexican-American youngsters have by the eighth grade developed defense techniques that allow them to function adequately in most classroom situations. Despite their adequacy, the teacher must not be deluded into thinking such students are able to apply what they learn, for there is no true reinforcement of this "learning." It must be remembered that many of these children return at the end of the school day to Spanish-speaking homes, to Mexican culture, to a system which does not encourage an exchange with their elders which might enrich the material they have been taught in school.
3. In a classroom where a majority of the students are Mexican American, a teacher must develop within the established curriculum a program meaningful to these youngsters. Such a program will stimulate the children to participate orally in the material they are being taught, to summarize what they have learned and to discuss key words and concepts. The hope is that they will internalize what they have learned through such determined and varied reinforcement.

4. Considering the variety of Mexican-American students, it is almost inevitable that the teacher will face the question of control. Knowledge of the Mexican culture should indicate that these children generally respond best to a disciplined situation with overtones of formality. A Mexican-American child is trained to see a teacher as a person equal in authority to his father, regardless of the sex of the teacher. But the teacher's role is to see to it that the authority reflects understanding, fairness and acceptance. A great disservice is done to a child when the teacher displays leniency towards habits that fail to conform to classroom or school routines — tardiness, neglect of deadlines, failure to come to class prepared.
5. A matter which could lead to complete breakdown of communication between the teacher and his Mexican-American students is the "embarrassment" of the child by the teacher. It is useful to note that the Spanish language has no equivalent for the English word "embarrass." For instance, in Spanish a person who is *embarasada* (past participle acting as an adjective) is pregnant. There are also expressions for turning red as a result of receiving a compliment (*ruborizarse*), for getting into an awkward situation (*comprometerse*); otherwise, to embarrass is literally to dishonor (*deshonorar, insultar, infamar*) or to shame (*avergonzar*). The fact that there is no Spanish word for "embarrass" should indicate that the speakers of the language do not treat lightly loss of stature. Thus, when a teacher finds it necessary to discipline by heaping guilt on a youngster, he should never do it in front of the youngster's peers. Such disciplinary action must always remain an individual confrontation, handled without witnesses.
6. Many Mexican-American children develop a negative self-image which comes from too many experiences of failure. These children rarely have a reservoir of success which makes it possible for them to cope with failures that may result from lack of application or knowledge. A teacher must create opportunities for these youngsters to achieve. A teacher must find methods of evaluating that are not dependent wholly on the basic skills. A teacher must understand that these youngsters are developing in two cultures, that they are learning two languages, that they are functioning in two worlds, that they are making adjustments and

decisions in order to achieve acceptance by the dominant culture. Teachers must not overlook the fact that compromises are sometimes made by these young people in order to function more adequately in two cultures that have many opposing values and patterns of behavior, and that the compromises they make bring them into conflict with their families, peers, school or whoever comes to play a part in determining the direction they will take.

7. It is strongly recommended that the positive approach be used rather than those approaches that immediately punish for lack of conformity. Teachers must teach the "new" values and standards in somewhat the same manner as a new skill is taught. If a youngster is constantly tardy he must be taught the importance of punctuality, rather than automatically be punished because he was not in his seat on time. Most youngsters will respond to explanations or lessons that teach the value of such things as punctuality, preparedness, participation, individual response, neatness, and so forth.
8. A teacher should take advantage of those experiences the Mexican-American youngster has outside of school to build concepts, to illustrate, to relate. *These youngsters are not culturally disadvantaged; they are culturally different.* This suggestion carries the implication that a teacher must go into the community and get acquainted with and, if necessary, even participate in community functions. Knowledge of the students' background and experiences is rarely to be found in the school record. It is difficult for these young people to answer questions relative to their home life or community, for they do not understand the "why" of the questioning.

   The cultural difference among students in the classroom should be utilized by teachers for developing the individual pupil's self-image, for enriching classroom experiences not only for the minority but for all students, and for developing a greater understanding among all people.
9. Teachers approaching the parents of these children must be aware of their limitations with the English language, ignorance of school procedure and the mysteries of teaching. Unless the teacher has established a rapport with a particular youngster that gives the teacher the proper entree, he is advised to work through

a home-school coordinator or liaison person to make the initial contacts. All schools should have home-school contact people who come from the community. These people should have a mutual acceptance from both the community and the school. In approaching a Mexican-American home it is important to follow familial protocol: the father is the head of the family, therefore teachers and school personnel must direct themselves to him first.

10. Established curricula should be expanded to include the culture, heritage and other contributions of the Mexican and Mexican American to the American scene. Electives should be established that lead to better knowledge and understanding of this minority. A greater emphasis should be placed on its role in the local community as well as in the national and international communities. A change of perspective will contribute greatly to the development of a more positive self-image, which in turn will create greater motivation, the key to learning and achievement. Those programs of a school that contribute to developing pride among Mexican Americans could easily become the springboards to participation, acceptance and ambition.

    However, caution must be exercised lest the new image created is not one that reflects the "folksy" stereotype typical of textbook illustrations, advertisements and fiesta days: i.e., the lazy male, the non-hygienic female, the sombrero, the *huaraches,* the burro. The Mexican people take a great pride in the new Mexico born of a great social revolution, and teachers should emphasize this newborn pride.

Recommended Readings

FORBES, JACK D., *Mexican Americans, A Handbook for Educators*, Berkeley: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1967.
An excellent handbook that provides the teacher of the Mexican American with materials that gives insight into the background of the Mexican culture and thinking. It also presents sixteen useful suggestions for educators. It additionally provides an excellent bibliography and a list of audio-visual materials.

HELLER, CELIA S., *Mexican American Youth, Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads*. New York: Random House, 1966.
A good introduction to some problems of Mexican-American youth. It may be somewhat dated for highly urban communities. Generally available in most paperback stores.

MADSEN, WILLIAM, *Mexican Americans of South Texas*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
An anthropological study of one county on the Mexican-Texas border, describing the sociocultural conditions of the Mexican American living there today. This text is helpful in determining the educational needs of these people.

MANUEL, HERSCHEL T., *Spanish-Speaking Children of the Southwest; Their Education and the Public Welfare*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965.
This book gives a closer picture of the problems faced by Mexican-American youngsters.

McWILLIAMS, CAREY, *The Mexicans in America*. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1968.
This booklet offers an excellent survey on Mexican-American history and its development. It is especially recommended for students on a secondary or early college level.

McWILLIAMS, CAREY, *North from Mexico — The Spanish-Speaking People of the United States*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1949.
A dated survey, but still considered to be one of the best works in this area. A reissue with a new introduction is soon to be released by Greenwood Press.

PAZ, OCTAVIO, *Labyrinth of Solitude — Life and Thought in Mexico*. (Translated by Lysander Kemp.) New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1961.
This book is a *must* for any person hoping to understand the thinking and cultural idiosyncrasies of the Mexican. It is easily available in most paperback stores.

PITT, LEONARD, *The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1890.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.

This well-written volume gives a different perspective to the social history of the California Mexican. Teachers of Mexican-American students will find many motivational springboards within the covers of this work.

RUBEL, ARTHUR J., *Across the Tracks — Mexican Americans in a Texas City.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966.
A good reading companion to Madsen's *Mexican Americans of South Texas.*

SAMORA, JULIAN, *La Raza: Forgotten Americans.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.
An excellent publication containing a series of essays that should develop a better understanding for *La Raza.*

SANCHEZ, GEORGE I., *Forgotten People. A Study of New Mexicans.* Albuquerque: New Mexico University Press, 1967.
A new edition of the history and development of the Hispano. The sections on education are especially good.

A Survey of Mexican History

When the earliest beginnings of culture in Mexico took place is vague. One thing that is certain is that man was not indigenous to the New World. No remains, such as those of Java man or Peking man, have ever been found on the American continent, nor were there any apelike primates in the Americas. It is generally agreed by anthropologists that the prototypes of the American Indians were varieties of homo sapiens who evolved in the Old World. The settlement of these prototypes in the New World is believed to have taken place during the last period of the Pleistocene, and that they arrived having already acquired cultural resources such as clothing, shelter and tools adequate at least to sustain them in cold climates. Their reasons for migration could have been flight from enemies or search for food. They probably came in small groups by way of eastern Siberia, the Bering Strait and Alaska. Obviously, these were a hardy and determined people, for the obstacles they had to overcome were great.

It is speculated that these people migrated in waves, thus accounting for some of the physical differences that exist among American Indians. The Mongoloid type, as exemplified by the Chinese, had not evolved, or at least was not common to the Siberian region during this Ice Age period. As a matter of fact, the farther Indians are from the Bering Strait, the less Mongoloid they look. Instead, they possess prominent noses, long heads and wavy hair, in contrast to the flat noses, round heads and straight hair typical of today's Mongolians. Additional differences that exist among Indians are explained by anthropologists through the theory of "genetic drift."

Though different theories exist as to the origin of man in the New World, the one outlined above is generally accepted.

Mexico possesses several centers of culture that reached very high levels of development. Most were located in places where the basic food staple, corn (*maize*), could be grown easily. (Needless to say, there were other domesticated plants. The list of native American

contributions to the world's larder is long; lima beans, tomatoes, peppers, most kinds of squash and pumpkins, avocados, cocoa, pineapple are but a few). Mexico's early civilized institutions revolved about this major crop. The organized system of raising corn led to the shaping of religion, with rituals and prayers for rain or other conditions favorable to the crop. The need to know the proper time for planting, cultivating and harvesting led to developments in astronomical observation and the creation of calendars and mathematics. In addition, the Mayans of the Yucatan Peninsula and southern Mexico understood the need for an abstract symbol to simplify mathematics and therefore invented the "zero" long before its use in the Old World. It might also be pointed out that the Mayan calendar was more accurate than the Julian calendar popularly used in Europe at the time of the discovery of the New World.

A complete and accurate study of the civilizations that developed in Mexico is most difficult because of the great destruction wreaked on them by the Spanish conquest and the Christianization of the Indian. The Spaniards destroyed cities, temples, works of art, pictographic records, libraries. They destroyed everything they estimated to be pagan; they destroyed in the name of necessity — that being control over the Indians.

What is known of Ancient Mexico has been determined mainly through the work of archaeologists digging in the refuse heaps around old dwelling places, or uncovering graves buried deep in the jungle. Archaeologists estimate that there are at least 10,000 sites of Ancient Mexico still unexplored. Each time a new site is discovered, revisions and corrections must be made of many of the accepted theories regarding these ancient cultures.

The Olmec, one of the earliest of the cultures, developed in the tropical lowlands of Veracruz. This culture created huge sculptured heads with moonlike faces and thick lips. In the high central plateau of Mexico, the Teotihuacan and Toltec cultures produced great religious centers such as the ones at San Juan, Teotihuacan and Tula. The Zapotecs and Mixtecs of Oaxaca built the great centers at Monte Alban and Mitla. The various Mayan civilizations created the magnificent structures at Bonampak, Palenque, Uxmal and Chichen Itza, which show a highly developed sense of the aesthetic. Most impressive is the fact that construction throughout Ancient Mexico was done

without metal tools.

These ancient people, despite all the refinements they had developed — a staple crop that made it possible for them to become a settled rather than a nomadic people, and the textiles which they made by weaving the fibers of the cotton, henequen and maguey plants — had neither beasts of burden nor the wheel. The geography of Mexico did not lend itself to extensive commercial exchange between the various cultures; therefore, there was little need for developing roads or equipment for carrying. Slave labor evidently sufficed for the needs they had. It is interesting to speculate on the changes that might have taken place had there been metal tools, beasts of burden and the wheel.

The Aztecs, who came late to the Mexican plateau, followed the Teotihuacans and the Toltecs. According to legend, they came seeking the fulfillment of a prophecy. In 1325 A.D., they found the omen they sought: an eagle perched on a cactus and devouring a serpent. On the site of this vision, an island in a saline lake, they built their city of Tenochtitlan (today Mexico City). Using adobe, carved stones and timber from the nearby forests, they built the city that made the invading Spaniards (1520 A.D.) gasp with astonishment and admiration. The invaders saw a beautifully designed island city connected to the mainland by great causeways. There were aqueducts that brought water from the springs of the Chapultepec hills. Canals threaded the city. Great squares were surrounded by large temples and pyramids. Spotlessly clean market places were encircled by homes and palaces; roof gardens showered cascades of flowers over walls of the houses. In only 200 years, the Aztecs had accomplished this miracle.

The Aztecs were a warrior people because their gods demanded human sacrifices. They conquered and controlled most of the tribes of the plateau. As tribute, the conquered tribes supplied humans for sacrifice, textiles, treasure and food. The Aztec conquest extended as far as the sea. From coastal colonies they received by porters a constant supply of seafood, fruit, vegetables and other plant products typical to the tropics.

The Aztecs were a highly organized society, with the priests and the nobles comprising the controlling groups. This ruling class had a highly developed intelligence system. Merchants and traders doubled as espionage agents; artists skilled at pictography were stationed

throughout the empire to record anything of interest. These news reports were relayed by speedy messengers to Tenochtitlan.

Such constant vigilance over tributaries kept the vast empire under strict Aztec control. The sophisticated system of intelligence warned Emperor Moctezuma (also known as Montezuma II) of the approach of the Spaniards. He had knowledge of Hernandez de Cordoba's landings at Yucatan in February of 1517, and of Juan de Grijalva's the following year; hence, Hernando Cortes' arrival at Veracruz in 1519 came as no surprise. Moctezuma had an accurate report, not only of the size of Cortes' army, but of how the Spaniards used horses and firearms.

Cortes was met by emissaries of Moctezuma and presented with gifts. The gifts consisted of fine feather work, precious stones, textiles and quantities of gold and silver, some of it in the shape of a large sun and a moon. After the gifts were presented, the Spaniards were requested to leave. However, the sight of the gifts whetted the appetites of the Spaniards for more gold and silver, and the emissaries were dispatched to bring more gold, after being told that it had a medicinal value for an illness from which they, the Spaniards, suffered. While Cortes waited and planned, the Totonacs (tributaries of the Aztecs) offered to support Cortes in any plan he might have.

Cortes soon started his march to Tenochtitlan. En route, he gained the support of the Tlazcalans, enemies of the Aztecs. As a consequence, the Spanish army had now increased from 500 to nearly 7,000 fighting men.

The story of the conquest of Mexico is easily one of the most fascinating, romantic events in history. It has chapters of intrigue, struggle, discovery, defeat — all the elements necessary to create a serial of highly exciting episodes. However, it is enough to state here that, through the power created by new weapons, horses, numbers of warriors and the strength gained from the internal dissatisfactions within the Aztec Empire itself, the weakness of Moctezuma and the legend of Quetzalcoatl, the Mexicans were ultimately conquered.

Probably this legend contributed most to the destruction of Aztec civilization. Quetzalcoatl, a man-god who was identified as the feathered serpent god, the god of the wind and of life, the creator of man, and so forth, was pictured in the Indian mind as a kind personage with fair skin and a beard who taught the people many

of their crafts and arts. The parallels between Christian principles and Quetzalcoatl's code are in fact most striking (the Indian god abhorred human sacrifice, promiscuity and drunkenness). According to the legend, Quetzalcoatl was tricked into debauchery and, shamed, fled into the east on a raft made of serpent skins. He promised, however, to return in the Year of One Reed. In terms of the Julian Calendar, the Year of One Reed was 1519 — the year Cortes arrived in Mexico. Cortes and his army also came from the east, and, finally, they were fair-skinned and had beards.

After traveling inland 200 miles, Cortes found the capital city of the Aztecs. Cortes used the "Trojan Horse" tactic, entering Tenochtitlan as a "friend" in order to conquer the city from within. But the plan was frustrated when an army arrived from Cuba to arrest Cortes for insubordination, and the "conqueror" was obliged to leave Tenochtitlan with the majority of his army to meet this direct threat. In his absence, the Indians rebelled against Moctezuma and the few Spaniards left behind. In the melee Moctezuma was killed. When Cortes returned victorious and with an even larger army, the entire city broke out in fighting. Cortes and his army were forced to retreat, in chaos. Many men lost their lives attempting to escape with their booty. This retreat is called "La Noche Triste."

Undaunted, Cortes determined to capture Tenochtitlan and launched an all-out attack. Again he enlisted the aid of the enemies of the Aztecs. After a lengthy siege and many fierce battles, the Aztecs were finally defeated and the city destroyed.

In 1521, the Spaniards began to build a new city on the ruins of the old one. They named their city "Mexico" and called the new addition to the Spanish Empire "New Spain."

The arrival of the Spaniards led to an amalgamation of two cultures, of two peoples, each in sharp contrast with the other. We have already indicated the origins of the Indian. The Spaniard who conquered Mexico was the distillation of 4,000 years of mixing and inter-mixing many cultures. The first outsiders to come to the Iberian Peninsula and leave material evidence of their settlement were the Phoenicians. As sea-farers and traders, they introduced to the Iberians the products of many other Mediterranean cultures. The Greeks soon followed the Phoenicians. They, too, were sea-farers and traders, and made addi-

tional cultural contributions. The Carthaginians also established colonies at various points on the peninsula, introducing customs, objects and other aspects of their North African culture.

With the conquest of the Carthaginians, the Romans were able to complete their conquest of all the lands surrounding the Mediterranean. Under Roman rule, Latin became the language of most of the people of Spain. The Romans also introduced their form of government, their law system and Christianity. In 395 A.D. the Roman Empire began to break up with the first barbarian invasions from Northern Europe. The Visigoths invaded Spain and brought to it changes in language, in law and in many aspects of daily living.

In 711 A.D. Spain was invaded by the Muslims, as part of their "holy war" to convert other peoples to their faith. Their invasion of the Iberian Peninsula across the Straits of Gibraltar started a series of wars that was to last nearly 800 years. With the Muslim, or Moorish, occupation of Spain, endless wonders from North Africa and the Middle East were made part of the Spanish culture. Architectural, agricultural, medical, mathematical and musical evidence of their long occupation is still abundantly evident in Spain.

During the Moorish occupation of Spain, still another culture further enriched the already Catholic Hispanic culture: Jews, fleeing from wars in Palestine, arrived in a series of immigrations. Most important to remember, though, is that for nearly 800 years there was a constant exchange among three strong religious groups — Islamic, Christian and Jewish. This exchange left lasting marks on the Spanish people.

When Queen Isabella of Castile married King Ferdinand of Aragon, the Christians of Spain were united into one great army which had the strength to drive out the Moorish invaders in 1492. It was the same year that ushered in Spain's Golden Age for, with the discovery of America, vast new sources of revenue were made available to Spain. With peace and these new resources, Spain experienced a renaissance and became a leader in the arts, reflecting the refinement of centuries of cultural influx.

The wars of Spain had trained many soldiers who now found outlets for their talents in the New World. These soldiers, whether they carried the standard of Spain or of God, ably established a great empire. Using Mexico City as an initial base, they marched out into

the countryside conquering and establishing outposts in the forms of presidios, missions or pueblos. The pages of the history of Mexico and the United States are made rich by the names of Cabeza de Vaca, Coronado, Viscaino, Cabrillo, Ulloa, Pineda, Onate, Espejo, Father Sierra, Father Kino and many, many others. The efforts of these men opened new frontiers and thus accelerated the progress of the natives of these areas. With the accomplishments of her soldiers, the expansion of aesthetics and her new wealth, Spain became the foremost power of the world for nearly 200 years.

The Spaniards who vanquished the Indians were as diverse and varied (religiously, politically, physically, ethnically) as the nations and cultures that had invaded Spain since the time of the Phoenicians. This heterogeneous invader of Mexico now mixed with the heterogeneous Indian, and the mixture created the Mexican. However, there remained great differences between the invader and the invaded for over 300 years. In fact, Spain imposed on her new colony a whole system of socio-political-economic organization which was to create differences and problems that have yet to be erased and continue to burden Mexico even as a modern nation. Reference to this "new" society has already been made in the first chapter of this resource unit, and students of national character have weighed heavily these differences in describing the character of the Mexican. (Reading in this area that is strongly recommended includes *The Labyrinth of Solitude* by Octavio Paz.)

The 300 years of Spanish control of New Spain demonstrate the strength of her colonial institutions; yet these same institutions created in turn the frictions that led ultimately to the war for independence. Mexico's struggle for independence from Spain's oligarchical control took place between 1808 and 1824. Father Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, long a student of those 18th century French writers who advocated equal rights for all men, became the first leader of the struggle. On September 16, 1810, Father Hidalgo proclaimed Mexican independence in the name of the lower classes of the country. However, his weakness as a military leader soon became evident, and he was defeated by the Spaniards despite his large following. Captured and then executed, Father Hidalgo was followed by another priest, Father Jose Maria Morelos y Pavon. For a brief period, Father Morelos led the revolution until he met the same fate as Father Hidalgo.

With the death of Father Morelos, the leadership of the revolution fell to General Agustin Iturbide. In 1821, the revolutionaries were finally triumphant, Mexico became independent of Spain and Iturbide proclaimed himself emperor. But he ruled only for a few months. The people of Mexico wanted no more kings; they wanted a republic.

The years that followed the rule of Iturbide were marked by many leaders who were motivated by high ideals and believed in republican government. However, the Mexican people were not quite ready for self-government, the 300 years of Spanish rule having denied to the majority (i.e., the mestizos and the Indians) any real participation in government. In the main, this majority was ignorant, illiterate and without property. Thus the numerous attempts made to remedy many of the social and economic ills of the country by establishing a stable government with a sound economy, by providing schools for the lower classes, and by attempting to put through forward-looking social projects, achieved little success.

From 1823 to 1910, Mexico's history is largely the biographies of three men: Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, Benito Juarez and Porfirio Diaz.

Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna ruled Mexico on and off from 1823 to 1855. Historians and biographers have yet to settle on a clear definition of who or what Santa Anna was. On the one hand, he had the ability and foresight to be "there" every time the national situation required that a leader pick up the reins of government. Eleven times he ruled Mexico — by popular demand, show of force or power play. Yet each time he chose to institute a dictatorship — a step that led in turn to a *coup d'etat* and his overthrow.

Santa Anna's dictatorial policies and the conspiracies of Anglo-Texans caused the rebellion that gained Texas its independence and created a series of events that led to the Mexican War of 1846-1848. (Literature on the Mexican War is quite extensive, yet few people are knowledgeable about it. Perhaps the negative implications that the war had for American policies of that time, particularly in terms of Manifest Destiny, pre-Civil War political machinations, international competition and the moral responsibility of the Monroe Doctrine have made it an unpopular war to study.) In any case, the Mexican War and its outcome implanted in the Mexican mind a great suspicion with regard to any future relations with its northern neighbor.

Coincidentally, this war created the Mexican American.

After this disastrous loss, Santa Anna was exiled, called back and then exiled again. Other leaders tried unsuccessfully to bring a stable and progressive government to the country, and out of this state of chaos rose Benito Juarez.

Juarez, a Zapotec Indian, became president of Mexico in 1856. Almost immediately, he attempted to put through a number of reforms: legal equality for all; limitation of church control over urban and rural property; religious toleration, and the redistribution of land. These liberal reforms met sharp opposition from the conservative element, and Mexico once again became prey to civil war when the Constitution of 1857 which contained these reforms was proclaimed.

This new chaos led to the concerted intervention by several powers of Europe. Napoleon III of France manipulated the intervention and, through the aid of Mexican conservative elements, established in Mexico the puppet government of Maximilian and Carlota.

Juarez attempted to drive out the invading Europeans. A crucial battle between the Mexicans and the forces of Napoleon III was fought at Puebla on May 5, 1862. Ironically, though the Mexicans won the battle, they lost the war, and Juarez was forced to flee to the north. (The United States could not enforce the Monroe Doctrine, for it was involved at the time in its own civil war.)

A series of European crises eventually called for the withdrawal of French forces in Mexico. As a consequence Maximilian was abandoned by Napoleon III, and Juarez was able to rally his own forces. This, together with the fact that the American Civil War had been concluded and that the United States sent 50,000 troops to the Mexican border to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, enabled Juarez to defeat and execute the weak Maximilian. Juarez then attempted to reestablish a constitutional government in Mexico, but he had very little success. Mexico continued to be plagued by many revolts and, in the midst of one, Juarez died.

Not long after his death in 1872, one of his generals, Porfirio Diaz, came into power. During the thirty-five years (1876-1910) of his rule, Diaz brought to Mexico a benevolent dictatorship. Under his iron-fisted direction, Mexico became stable and progressive. Diaz encouraged foreign business, and Mexico soon became prosperous and one of the most financially sound nations in the world. However,

the prosperity was enjoyed by only a very small fraction of the population. The majority remained what they had been since Spanish rule — ignorant, poor, subjugated.

The mass dissatisfaction that Diaz' dictatorship created was bound eventually to erupt in violence. Diaz' modernization of Mexico, which included industrialization and new systems of communication and transportation, could not outweigh the graft, favoritism, peonage and the inequalities suffered by the majority of his people. In 1908, Francisco Madero, an intellectual and a member of the wealthy class, wrote a book criticizing Diaz and his supporters. Madero recommended many political reforms, and his program found support among other intellectuals as well as ambitious men who had been waiting for an opportunity to gain control. In 1910, Madero was declared a presidential candidate, but he was arrested for sedition by Diaz. He escaped to Texas where he then issued a plan for political reforms. This plan spread throughout Mexico, and the downtrodden promptly gave it their support. Leaders sprang up who quickly recruited these people into military forces. Diaz, however, refused to use force to maintain his position in office; instead he resigned and exiled himself to Europe.

Madero, who succeeded Diaz to the presidency of Mexico, had no political experience. His administration was therefore characterized by blunders, indecision and concessions to old supporters of Diaz. In addition, he was ill-advised and constantly opposed by foreign representatives in the country.

A conservative counter-revolution against the Madero regime was successful, and Madero himself was assassinated. During the next seven years (1913-1920), Mexico was in a constant state of ferment. Leaders rose and fell; there was a near war in 1916 with the United States which was anxious about possible German military support of the Mexican conservatives, and the Communists attempted to establish some sort of force in Mexico. During these years the names of Pancho Villa, Emiliano Zapata, Venustiano Carranza and Alvaro Obregon were especially prominent in Mexican history as the figures who took the spirit of the revolution (as outlined by Madero) and gave it the direction, leadership and symbols that it needed. Though they contested among themselves for power, out of these contests came the nucleus of a New Mexico.

The battles, the destruction, the pillage, the deaths and the endless domestic crises caused a great migration of Mexicans to the United States. Added to this, World War I had caused great labor shortages in the United States, and these shortages increased the number of emigrants still further. Literally thousands of Mexicans were recruited for work in the mines of Arizona, the agricultural fields of California and Colorado, the steel industry of West Virginia and the cotton fields of Texas. Many of them were to settle permanently in the United States, as had millions of emigrants before them who had come to the United States from Europe as refugees.

By 1920, the brutal aspects of the Revolution had become extinct, and the period that followed was one of implementing the Constitution of 1917. In recent years, there have been many adjustments and reforms. Much land has been redistributed, new industries have been built, great educational and health programs have been instituted, and so forth.

The study of modern-day Mexico is too complex, too innovative, too encompassing to be reduced even to these broad generalities. (Readings in this area that are strongly recommended include *Six Faces of Mexico* by Russell Ewing et al., and *Mexico: Land of Sunshine and Shadow* by Donald D. Brand.) However, every teacher who works with Mexican Americans must be familiar with it, for, as has been stated previously, most Mexican Americans are bi-cultural. In other words they are American, and they are Mexican. Thus the rationale for the term Mexican American *without* the hyphen.

A Chronological Outline of Mexican History

I. **Mexico Before 1500**
   - A. The Mayan Empire
     1. Origin — Theories
        - a. Asiatic migration
        - b. Malay-Polynesian
        - c. Japanese-Chinese
     2. Culture
   - B. The Toltecs
     1. Origin
     2. Culture
   - C. The Chichimecs
     1. Origin
     2. Culture
   - D. The Aztecs
     1. Origin
        - a. Theory
        - b. Legend
     2. Culture
        - a. Language
        - b. Government
        - c. Social organization
        - d. Agriculture
        - e. Architecture
        - f. Religion
        - g. Military organization
        - h. Legends

II. **The Spaniards**
   - A. Origin
     1. North African
     2. Phoenician
     3. Carthagenian
     4. Greek
     5. Celt
     6. Roman
     7. Visigoth
     8. Moslem
   - B. Discovery of New World
     1. Caribbean
     2. Southeastern United States
   - C. Conquest of Mexico (1519)
     1. Cortes
     2. The army of Cortes
     3. Tenochitlan (Mexico City)
     4. The other peoples of Mexico
     5. The new people — *el mestizo*
     6. Spanish Colonial Institutions
        - a. Political
        - b. Economic
        - c. Religious
        - d. Social
   - D. Territorial Expansion and Exploration
     1. Cabeza de Vaca
     2. De Soto
     3. Coronado
     4. Viscaino
     5. Cabrillo
     6. Ulloa
     7. Piñeda
     8. Oñate
     9. Espejo
   - E. Contributions of the Indians to European Culture
     - A. Food
     - B. Mineral
     - C. Medicine
     - D. Animal
     - E. Architecture

III. **Colonial Mexico (1560-1822)**
   - A. Political organization
   - B. Religious organization
   - C. Economic organization
   - D. Social organization
     (To be studied in terms of their lasting influence on the Mexican people)

IV. **Settlement of the Southwest**
   - A. Santa Fe (1598-1609)
   - B. Missionary expansion
     1. Father Kino
     2. Father Serra
     3. Others
   - C. Commercial and agricultural development of New Mexico and California

V. **The Revolutions of Hidalgo and Morelos (1810-1815)**
   - A. Causes
   - B. Results

VI. **Independence (1822)**
- A. Iturbide (1822-1823)
  1. The Empire
  2. The weaknesses in government
  3. The power of the Church
  4. The Indian
- B. Santa Anna
  1. Rise to power
  2. Inconsistencies

VII. **Era of Santa Anna (1823-1855)**
- A. Mexico — United States Relations prior to 1848
- B. Texas
  (The story of the Alamo should be studied from the Mexican point of view also)
- C. War with the United States
  1. Texas — Taylor
  2. California — Fremont
  3. Invasion of Mexico — Scott
     (The story of the United States-Mexican War should be studied from the Mexican point of view also)
- D. Guadalupe-Hidalgo Treaty, February 2, 1848
  1. Guarantees to the new Americans
  2. Territorial acquisition by the United States
  3. Other acquisitions
     a. Economy
     b. New industries
     c. Legal system
     d. Language
     e. System of transportation and communication
     f. 300 years of experience
- E. Gadsden Purchase

VIII. **Era of Juarez**
- A. Biographical study
- B. *Ley Juarez*
- C. The War of Reform
- D. *Leyes de Reforma, 1859*
- E. Invasion of Mexico by France — Napoleon III, 1862
- F. The Empire of Maximilian, 1862-1867
- G. Juarez — President, 1860-1872
  1. The changes he wrought
  2. The strength of tradition

IX. **Era of Diaz**
- A. Biographical study
- B. Diaz — President, 1876-1911
  1. Contributions
  2. Failures
- C. Seeds for revolution

X. **The Revolution (1910-1924)**
- A. The beginning
- B. The struggle for control
- C. The leaders
  1. Madero
  2. Huerta
  3. Zapata
  4. Villa
  5. Carranza
  6. Obregón
  7. Calles
- D. The effects of 14 years of upheaval

XI. **Relations with the United States (1910-1922)**
- A. Attitude toward Madero
- B. U.S. invasion of Mexico
- C. American troops in Mexico
- D. ABC Mediation
- E. Pershing-Villa Campaign
- F. Labor import
- G. World War I
- H. Communist activity in Mexico

XII. **Calles (1924-1936)**
- A. Church vs Calles
- B. Formation of PNR
- C. Era of disturbance and unrest
- D. The Depression
- E. Relations with the United States
- F. Fall of Calles

XIII. **Cardenas (1936-1940)**
- A. Introduction of a new attitude in government
- B. The beginning of a new Mexico
- C. *Indianismo*
- D. Expropriation of foreign-owned oil properties
- E. PRM

XIV. **Camancho (1940-1946)**
- A. World War II
- B. Industrial changes
- C. The rise of the social painter
- D. Communism in Mexico

XV. **Aleman (1946-1952)**
- A. Education
- B. Mexico steps on the world scene
- C. New relations with the United States
- D. Graft

XVI. **Cortines (1952-1958)**

XVII. **Mateos (1958-1964)**

XVIII. **Ordaz (1964-)**

Bibliography of Mexican History and Culture

BERNAL, IGNACIO and JACQUE SOUSTELLE, *Mexico: Pre-Hispanic Paintings.* United Nations: United Nations Economic and Social Council, World Art Series, No. 10, 1958.
Excellent plates of select examples of Indian paintings. The narrative gives a good interpretation and understanding of the people and their art.

BRAND, DONALD D., *Mexico: Land of Sunshine and Shadow.* Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1966.
A compact volume that gives an understanding about the many aspects of Mexico. The author has relied greatly on personal observation and contact for his information.

EWING, RUSSELL C., *Six Faces of Mexico.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1968.
Six authorities on six different aspects of Mexico (history, people, geography, government, economy, literature and art) give an excellent survey of past and contemporary Mexico. This book is highly recommended for a cursory but good survey of Mexico.

GIBSON, CHARLES, *Spain in America.* New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966.
The author's approach gives the reader a real understanding of the Spaniard and his institutions in his colonial empire.

HANKE, LEWIS, *Mexico and the Caribbean.* Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1967.
A good survey that is enhanced by selected readings written by recognized authorities.

JOHNSON, WILLIAM W., *Heroic Mexico — A Violent Emergence of a Modern Nation.* Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968.
This journalistic work gives a fine survey of the causes for the revolution, and is especially outstanding on reporting the revolution itself.

JOHNSON, WILLIAM W., *Mexico* (Life World Library Series). New York: Time-Life Books, 1966.
In addition to relating the story of Mexico pictorially, this book offers a quick but good survey in narrative form.

LEONARD, JONATHAN NORTON, *Ancient America* (Great Ages of Man Series). New York: Time-Life Books, 1967.
This volume is an excellent companion to Johnson's *Mexico* listed above.

LEON-PORTILLA, MIGUEL, *Aztec Thought and Culture.* (Translated by Jack Emory Davis.) Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1963.
A beautiful study giving the thought and culture as interpreted from the original writings of the Aztecs.

LEWIS, OSCAR, *The Children of Sanchez.* New York: Vintage Books, 1961.
The author takes an intimate look at the disadvantaged in Mexico City. This anthropological study is good for making contrasts and comparison between the urban and the rural.

LEWIS, OSCAR, *Tepoztlán: Village in Mexico.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.
An anthropological study of rural life in Mexico.

PARKES, HENRY B., *A History of Mexico.* Boston: Houghton-Miffiin Company, 1966.
This is a fine textbook on the history of Mexico.

SANCHEZ, GEORGE I., *Mexico.* (Todays World in Focus Series.) Boston: Ginn and Company, 1966.
The author gives a quick, complete survey of Mexico's history and culture. A good introductory work.

SIMPSON, LESLEY B., *Many Mexicos.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
A comprehensive study about the history and culture of Mexico written in a style that reflects a real feeling and understanding for the Mexican.

Sources of Information

Henry E. Huntington Library
1151 Oxford Road
San Marino, California

Southwest Museum
234 Museum Drive
Los Angeles, California

Mexican American Studies Project
Division of Research
Graduate School of Business Administration
University of California at Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90024

University of Arizona Press
Box 3398
College Station
Tucson, Arizona 85700

University of New Mexico Press
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

University of Texas Press
Austin, Texas 78712

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
1 Garden Circle
Hotel Claremont
Berkeley, California 94705

Librería Universitaria
Ciudad Universitaria
México 20, D. F.
México

Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia
México, D. F.
México

Mexican American groups also publish or circulate materials. To determine what is currently available it is necessary to contact such groups locally.

Mexican American Political Association
Mexican American Opportunity Foundation
League of United Latin American Citizens
Mexican American Educators Association